

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

SHAR-RIK MOLLEY,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Civ. No. 16-1920 (NLH)
	:	
v.	:	MEMORANDUM OPINION
	:	
OFFICER VARGAS, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

APPEARANCES:

SHAR-RIK MOLLEY
243576
ACJF
5060 ATLANTIC AVE
MAYS LANDING, NJ 08330
Plaintiff Pro se

HILLMAN, District Judge

THIS MATTER having been opened by the Court sua sponte, and
it appearing that:

1. Plaintiff Shar-rik Molley ("Plaintiff") recently filed
three civil rights actions which were assigned to this Court.
See Molley v. Vargas, No. 16-1920 ("Molley-I") ; Molley v. Cohen,
No. 16-2165 ("Molley-II") ; and Molley v. DeBose, No. 16-2297
("Molley-III").

2. On March 28, 2016, Plaintiff submitted a Complaint in
the instant matter alleging violations of his civil rights
pursuant to 42 U.S.C. s 1983. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff

thereafter submitted a motion for appointment of pro bono counsel. (ECF No. 9.)

3. On September 13, 2016, the Court entered an Order, granting Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and informing Plaintiff that summons would not yet issue as the Court must conduct its sua sponte screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A. (ECF No. 10.)

4. During this same time period, in Molley-III, the Court denied Plaintiff's initial application to proceed in forma pauperis (Civil Action No. 16-2297, ECF Nos. 4-5), as well as his second application (Id., ECF Nos. 7-8).

5. The Court sent a copy of the Opinion and Order denying the second application to Plaintiff at his last known address at the Atlantic County Justice Facility, however, the Opinion and Ordered were returned to the Court with a notation that Plaintiff was no longer housed at the Justice Facility. (Id., ECF No. 12.)

6. Apparently before he received the Court's September 29th Opinion and Order denying his second application to proceed in forma pauperis, Plaintiff submitted a third application. (Id., ECF No. 9.) The Court entered an Opinion and Order on October 27, 2016 denying that application (Id., ECF Nos. 10-11) and the copy of those documents sent to Plaintiff at the jail also were returned marked undeliverable (Id., ECF No. 13).

7. Since his release from Atlantic County Justice Facility, Petitioner has not communicated with the Court regarding his Complaint in this case, including failing to provide the Court with his new address in violation of L. Civ. R. 10.1. See L. Civ. R. 10.1(a) ("Counsel and/or unrepresented parties must advise the Court of any change in their or their client's address within seven days of being apprised of such change by filing a notice of said change with the Clerk.").

8. Based on Petitioner's failure to update his address in compliance with Local Civil Rule 10.1, the Court will administratively terminate this matter and dismiss his Motion for Pro Bono Counsel without prejudice. If Petitioner updates his address and otherwise satisfies all appropriate Rules, the Court will re-open this action to conduct its screening of the Complaint and address the Motion.

9. An appropriate order follows.

Dated: March 2, 2017
At Camden, New Jersey

s/ Noel L. Hillman
NOEL L. HILLMAN, U.S.D.J.